



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/644,567

08/20/2003

Scott G. Walton

84613-US1

6607

26384 7590 12/14/2007
NAVAL RESEARCH LABORATORY
ASSOCIATE COUNSEL (PATENTS)
CODE 1008.2
4555 OVERLOOK AVENUE, S.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20375-5320

EXAMINER

MCDONALD, RODNEY GLENN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1795

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

12/14/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

MAILED

DEC 14 2007

GROUP 1700

Application Number: 10/644,567
Filing Date: August 20, 2003
Appellant(s): WALTON ET AL.

Joseph T. Grunkemeyer
For Appellant

SUPPLEMENTAL EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed January 23, 2006 appealing from the Office action mailed May 27, 2005.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal. However this was previously remanded with instructions to address an Evidence submission, a potential 35 U.S.C. 112 6th paragraph consideration and a potential 35 U.S.C. 112 2nd paragraph consideration in Appeal No.2007-1470.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct. It is noted that the evidence filed August 29, 2005 and with the Appeal Brief of January 23, 2006 was not entered. See the Advisory Action of December 6, 2007.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct. There is also a new ground of rejection to be applied. Namely a new 35 U.S.C. 112 2nd paragraph rejection has been made.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

Art Unit: 1795

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

Please note that in the Evidence section of the previous Examiner's Answer of February 27, 2007 an incorrect reference to Cano et al. 6,146,635 was cited and never intended to be cited. The numbers of the cited patent number were transposed. Instead the relied upon reference should be 6,416,635 to Hurwitt et al. It is reflected in the listing below.

Meger et al., "Beam-generated plasmas for processing applications", Physics of plasmas, Volume 8, Number 5, May 2001, pp. 2558-2564.

6,416,635	Hurwitt et al.	7-2002
4,336,277	Bunshah et al.	6-1982
3,436,332	Oda et al.	4-1969
3,393,142	Moseson	7-1968

Claim Construction - 35 U.S.C. 112 6th paragraph

At the outset the examiner has determined that means-plus-function language exists in claim 1 and 35 U.S.C. 112 sixth paragraph is applicable.

- 1) Claim 1, line 5, "magnetic means for confining....."
- 2) Claim 1, line 9, "sputtering means"
- 3) Claim 1, line 10, "vaporization means"

For 1) the magnetic means structure is defined on page 7 lines 6-7 and with Fig. 1 item 4. The magnetic means structure is well known in the art and a magnetic coil or

Art Unit: 1795

permanent magnet would serve as the structure. Fig. 1 of the prior art to Meger relied on in the rejection below show a field coil to produce a magnetic field.

For 2) the sputtering means structure is defined on page 2 lines 6-17 and page 6 line 7.

For 3) the vaporization means structure is defined on page 6 lines 7-8.

(9) Grounds of Rejection

NEW GROUND(S) OF REJECTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1, line 2, is indefinite because the term "much" is a word of degree and the specification appears to provide no standard for measuring that degree.

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claims 1-3, 7-9 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meger et al. "Beam-generated plasmas for processing applications", Physics of plasmas, Volume 8, Number 5 May 2001, pp. 2558-2564 in view of Moseson (U.S. Pat. 3,393,142).

Regarding claim 1, Meger et al. teach a plasma system. (See Abstract) The plasma system has an electron beam source that has a width much larger than its

Art Unit: 1795

thickness. i.e. A thin (about 2 cm) sheet plasma with a large area (i.e. width). (See Page 2563) The average electron energy is from 1-5 KeV. (See Abstract) A gas is provided such as argon, nitrogen, or oxygen. A pair of Helmholtz field coils confines the beam. (Page 2559) The temperature of the plasma can be 1 eV. (See Abstract) As to the "capability" of the apparatus working in 10 mTorr of oxygen since the electron beam is produced in the same apparatus with the same characteristics as required by Applicant's electron beam it is believed the that electron beam source apparatus is "capable" of operating at 10 mTorr of oxygen.

Regarding claim 8, the electron beam source is a linear hollow cathode beam source. (See Fig. 1B)

Regarding claim 9, argon, nitrogen or oxygen can be used. (See page 2559)

Regarding claim 15, the plasma sheet can be $60 \times 60 \text{ cm}^2$. (See Abstract)

The difference between Merger et al. and the present claims is that the use of a sputtering target is not discussed (Claims 1, 2), locating a substrate for deposition on is not discussed (Claims 3), the source being select from metals, alloys, semiconductors, or non-conducting materials (claim 7).

With regard to Applicant's claim 1, Moseson teach an apparatus for establishing an ion plasma adjacent an ion target for sputtering of the ion target to form films on a substrate. (Column 1 lines 60-64) With regard to Applicant's claim 1 and considering Figure 4 of Moseson, the apparatus can comprise an electron beam source comprised of a filament 41 guided by a tubular member 32 into the interior of an adaptor 184, which rests on the plate 50. The adaptor 184 has a nozzle 185, which extends in the

Art Unit: 1795

direction of an anode 181. The tubular member 32 and the adaptor 184 jointly operate to provide a stream of electrons, which issues through the nozzle 185 in a direction substantially parallel to the plate 50. (Column 6 lines 36-43) The configurations of the adaptor 184 and the nozzle 185 are best apparent from Fig. 5 of the drawings. From this figure it will be recognized that the nozzle 185 defines a rectangular aperture 187, which is similar to the previously described aperture 155 shown in Fig. 3. Dotted lines in Fig. 5 indicate the configuration on anode 181. This anode configuration corresponds to the configuration of the aperture 87, so that an approximately prismatic ion plasma will be formed between the nozzle 185 and the anode 181 in the absence of a magnetic field. Dotted lines 188 in Fig. 4 are intended to outline this ion sheet. (Column 6 lines 44-55) The apparatus shown in Figs. 4 and 5 has the advantage that the ion plasma sheet is in a horizontal plane. (Column 6 lines 72-74) From Fig. 5 the width of the electrons beam is much larger than its thickness. (See Fig. 5) Considering Figure 4 of Moseson, the plasma sheet exists in the horizontal plane (Column 6 lines 72-74) produced from the electrons and has a width, thickness and length as seen and suggested in Figs. 4 and 5. (See Figures 4 and 5) Considering Figure 4 of Moseson, an electromagnetic coil 193 is positioned to establish parallel field lines and control the plasma and thus the sputtered film density on the substrate. The coil 193 may be movable (Column 6 lines 69-71) in order to effect the uniformity of film thickness on the substrate surface. (Column 4 lines 65-68) The plasma is in a horizontally sheet. (Column 6 lines 72-73) Considering Fig. 4 of Moseson, an ion target 95 is present for

Art Unit: 1795

depositing a film of coatings on substrates. (Column 6 lines 56-62) Considering Fig. 4 of Moseson, a substrate 190 is present for deposition upon. (Column 6 lines 59-62)

With regards to Applicant's claim 2, the target 95 is connected to battery 102 in order to provide the bias in order to attract ions out of the plasma sheet for sputtering. (Column 6 lines 18-35; Column 6 lines 56-62)

With regards to Applicant's claim 3, the electrical bias is DC bias as shown schematically in Fig. 4. (See Figure 4)

With regards to Applicant's claim 7, the Moseson recognize that metallic elements and many alloys have been sputtered in the prior art (Column 1 lines 24-27) and their invention provides an apparatus for depositing those thin film materials. (Column 1 lines 53-56) A target is used for depositing the films. (Column 6 lines 56-62)

The motivation for utilizing a sputtering target, locating a substrate for deposition and selecting from metals, alloys, semiconductors, or non-conducting materials for deposition in an electron beam apparatus is that it allows for reducing the energy requirements of sputtering operations. (Column 1 lines 50-53)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Meger et al. by utilizing a sputtering target, locating a substrate for deposition and selecting from metals, alloys, semiconductors, or non-conducting materials for deposition as taught by Moseson because it allows for reducing the energy requirement for sputtering operations.

Art Unit: 1795

Claims 4, 5, and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meger et al. in view of Moseson as applied to claims 1-3, 7-9 and 15 above, and further in view of Oda et al. (U.S. Pat. 3,436,332).

The differences not yet discussed are the substrate being electrically biased is not discussed (claim 4), the electrical bias being DC or RF is not discussed (claim 5) and where the target and the substrate are biased (claim 10).

Oda et al. teach biasing the substrate. The substrate can be biased by a DC electric source or an AC electric source. (Column 3 lines 11-18) Oda et al. further suggest that the target be sputtered by applying a bias voltage as well. (Column 2 lines 70-72; Column 3 lines 1-5)

The motivation for biasing the substrate and utilizing DC or RF sources to bias the substrate is that it prevents electrons from entering the electron guide tube 16. (Column 3 lines 15-18)

The motivation for biasing both the substrate and the target is that it allows for deposition of films. (Column 3 line 5)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have biased the substrate, utilized DC or RF sources to bias the substrate and to have biased both the substrate and the target as taught by Oda et al. because it allows for preventing electrons from entering the electron guide tube and for depositing films.

Claims 6 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meger et al. in view of Moseson as applied to claims 1-3, 7-9 and 15 above, and further in view of Hurwitt et al. (U.S. Pat. 6,416,635).

The differences not yet discussed is the target and the substrate being adjustable is not discussed (claim 6) and a sputtering magnetron being utilized is not discussed (Claim 12).

With regard to Applicant's claim 6, Hurwitt et al. teach that either the target or the substrate can be moved relatively to one another. (Column 5 lines 47-53) Also, Moseson suggest adjusting the beam position by moving the magnet field. (See Moseson discussed above)

The motivation for moving the target and the substrate relative to one another is that it allows for improving uniformity. (Column 6 lines 3-8)

With regard to Applicant's claim 12, Hurwitt et al. teach that a magnet assembly can be utilized behind the target for confining and enhancing the plasma during sputtering. (Column 6 lines 56-59)

The motivation for utilizing a magnetron is that it allows for confining and enhancing the plasma during sputtering. (Column 6 lines 56-59)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have moved the substrate and target relative to one another and to have utilized a magnetron for confining and enhancing the plasma during sputtering as taught by Hurwitt et al. because it allows for forming uniform films and for confining and enhancing the plasma during sputtering.

Art Unit: 1795

Claims 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meger et al. in view of Moseson as applied to claims 1-3, 7-9 and 15 above, and further in view of Bunshah et al. (U.S. Pat. 4,336,277).

The differences not yet discussed are utilizing a vaporization means is not discussed (claim 13) and positioning the electron beam produced plasma between the source material and the substrate is not discussed (claim 14).

With regard to claims 13 and 14, Bunshah et al. suggest placing a vaporization means in a chamber opposite substrates with an electron beam means positioned between the vaporization means and the substrates. (See Figure; Column 3 lines 25-27; Column 56-68)

The motivation for utilizing a vaporization means and locating the electron beam between the source and the substrate is that it allows for producing high quality coatings. (Column 1 lines 35-36)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have utilized a vaporization means and positioned the electron beam produced plasma between the source material and the substrate as taught by Bunshah et al. because it allows for producing high quality coatings.

(10) Response to Argument

A. *Response to the arguments for claims 1-3, 7-9 and 15 rejected as obvious over Meger et al. in view of Moseson.*

i). *Discussion of Appellant's Submitted Evidence:*

Appellant's arguments directed toward the evidence are not found persuasive because the evidence was never entered in the record. The Remand of September 25, 2007 requested that the record be clarified as to whether the evidence was entered. The Examiner has mailed an Advisory Action stating that the evidence has not been entered. The reason for non-entry of the evidence is that Appellant has failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented.

ii). *Response to the arguments:*

In response to the argument that there is no motivation for combining Moseson with Meger et al. because Moseson teaches the desirability of reducing the energy requirements of sputtering operations while Meger et al. shows utilizing increased energy for operation, it is argued that there is motivation to combine because Moseson establish that a sputtering target or source is utilizable in an apparatus where an electron beam is used to generate a plasma for performing a sputtering process and will produce quality films. Furthermore, Meger et al. teach an electron beam for generating the plasma and suggest utilizing the ***"plasma for processing applications"***. Therefore when considering the teachings of Moseson in which a sputtering ***"process"*** is performed it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Meger et al.

Art Unit: 1795

by placing a sputtering target in Meger et al.'s apparatus since **"processing"** is what is required to take place in their apparatus. (See Meger et al. and Moseson discussed above)

In response to the argument that the phrase **"plasma for processing applications"** in Meger would not suggest sputtering and is merely speculative, it is argued as discussed above that sputtering can be considered to be a plasma **"process"** and thus is suggestive of a **"plasma processing applications"**. This evidenced by the teachings of Moseson which show the sputtering plasma process application. Furthermore, the phrase **"plasma for processing applications"** is construable to include sputtering and other methods (i.e. etching) and is a term of art construed to include numerous processing embodiments. Further evidence that **"plasma for processing applications"** is a term of art is readily available in Handbooks such as "Handbook of Deposition Technologies for Films and Coatings" from Noyes Publications which mentions that **"processing plasma is a plasma that is used in materials processing"** and that such **"plasmas for processing"** are used in sputtering. (See Moseson and Meger et al. discussed above) (Note that excerpts from the "Handbook of Deposition Technologies for Films and Coatings" is attached for convenience.)

B. Response to the arguments for claims 4, 5, 10 rejected as obvious over Meger et al. in view of Moseson and further in view of Oda et al.

In response to the argument that Oda et al. does not suggest biasing the substrate, it is argued that Oda et al. at Column 3 lines 11-14 suggest electrically biasing the substrate where it states that "it is possible to employ a positive or negative DC electric source or an AC electric source as the substrate bias electric power supply 56". (See Oda et al. discussed above)

C. Response to the arguments for claims 6 and 12 rejected as obvious over Meger et al. in view of Moseson and further in view of Hurwitt et al.

Appellant has argued that there is no motivation to combine Meger and Moseson to rebut the rejection of claims 6 and 12. This argument has previously been addressed by the Examiner above and this response applies here as well.

D. Response to the arguments for claims 13 and 14 as obvious over Meger in view of Moseson and further in view of Bunshah.

Appellant has argued that there is no motivation to combine Meger and Moseson to rebut the rejection of claims 13 and 14. This argument has previously been addressed by the Examiner above and this response applies here as well.

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

This examiner's answer contains a new ground of rejection set forth in section (9) above. Accordingly, appellant must within **TWO MONTHS** from the date of this answer

exercise one of the following two options to avoid *sua sponte* **dismissal of the appeal** as to the claims subject to the new ground of rejection:

(1) **Reopen prosecution.** Request that prosecution be reopened before the primary examiner by filing a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 with or without amendment, affidavit or other evidence. Any amendment, affidavit or other evidence must be relevant to the new grounds of rejection. A request that complies with 37 CFR 41.39(b)(1) will be entered and considered. Any request that prosecution be reopened will be treated as a request to withdraw the appeal.

(2) **Maintain appeal.** Request that the appeal be maintained by filing a reply brief as set forth in 37 CFR 41.41. Such a reply brief must address each new ground of rejection as set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(vii) and should be in compliance with the other requirements of 37 CFR 41.37(c). If a reply brief filed pursuant to 37 CFR 41.39(b)(2) is accompanied by any amendment, affidavit or other evidence, it shall be treated as a request that prosecution be reopened before the primary examiner under 37 CFR 41.39(b)(1).

Extensions of time under 37 CFR 1.136(a) are not applicable to the TWO MONTH time period set forth above. See 37 CFR 1.136(b) for extensions of time to reply for patent applications and 37 CFR 1.550(c) for extensions of time to reply for ex parte reexamination proceedings.

Art Unit: 1795

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,



Rodney G. McDonald

Conferees:



Nam X. Nguyen




Romulo Delmendo

Appeal Conference

Art Unit: 1795

A Technology Center Director or designee must personally approve the new ground(s) of rejection set forth in section (9) above by signing below.


Kathryn Gorges
Director Designee